

REMARKS

We comment as follows where appropriate by reference to the sub-headings utilised in the May 25, 2011 Office Action.

Response to Arguments

We note that a new rejection under 35 USC 103(a) is necessitated by amendment of the claims. We shall comment later in this response on this new rejection (under the sub-heading “Claim rejections – 35 USC 103”).

We note that in numbered paragraph 5 of the Action the Examiner has indicated that “Applicant has not expressly excluded aminosilane”. We have amended independent claims 1, 40 and 42 by stating that the method comprises applying “an activation treatment to the surface of the coating wherein the activation treatment *consists of* ... and *optionally an additive*”. This amendment makes it clear that the activation treatment can only contain an organic solvent and adhesion promoter and optionally an additive. In light of this we believe that the claim now expressly excludes the possibility of the adhesion promoter being an aminosilane.

Applicants have further amended the claims. In brief summary Applicants have specified the organic coating that is being activated by introducing the subject matters of claim 37 into each of the independent claims. In addition each of the independent claims specifies the enhancement of adhesion of the subject particular organic coating to a further coating and/or to other entities. We have particularly specified the said further coating and/or other entities by incorporating the subject matter of claim 38 into each of the independent claims.

In addition we have made further amendments to the claims as indicated above.

We now comment on the particular rejections in the current Official Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 USC 112 fourth paragraph as failing to further limit claim 1. In response claim 25 has been canceled.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 10, 23-25, 27 and 29-45 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meder (5,212,017) in view of Fey (US 5,248,334). The subject rejection encompasses all the independent claims i.e. independent claims 1, 40 and 42. In response to this rejection we have further amended the claims as noted above.

Meder discloses the use of a priming formulation comprising an aprotic solvent having a specific solubility parameter (amide based solvent is used in the examples) together with an aminosilane adhesion promoter. While the substrate used in the examples is a polyimide film, column 11 line 22 indicates that a laminate can also be primed using this formulation.

The new independent claims 1, 40 and 42 have been restricted to an activation treatment consisting of a solvent and particular adhesion promoters. The list of adhesion promoters do not include any silane based materials. The restriction of the activation treatment to “consisting of” type language means that there are no silane based adhesion promoters used in the activation treatments.

The final Office Action also makes reference to Fey, indicating that a person skilled in the art would have been motivated to look to other non-silane adhesion promoters including organic amine compounds listed in Fey. Fey describes a method of overcoating a silicone substrate with a protective paint. The main aim of the technology described in the present application is to provide a method for activating a coated substrate. A person skilled in the

art, wanting non-silane based adhesion promoters would need to look at other technology that would be suitable for activation of a coated substrate since the problems associated with having an additional coating and trying to apply another layer on top of it would be different to merely activating a non-coated substrate.

Fey teaches the use of a primer composition consisting essentially of (column 2, line 65 onwards) a solvent component and a primer component. The primer component consists essentially of an aminoalkyl- substituted trialkoxy silane, a carboxylic acid salt of tin and optionally an organic amine. The new independent claims 1, 40 and 42 have been restricted to an activation treatment consisting of a solvent and particular adhesion promoters of interest. The list of adhesion promoters does not include any silane or tin based materials. The restriction of the activation treatment to “consisting of” type language means that even if an organic amine was used as an adhesion promoter, it would need to be used alone with a solvent without inclusion of silane or tin based materials. The present application is directed to a different invention to that disclosed by Fey.

The difference in the technologies used by Fey and the present application further highlights the need for different treatments – one to address activation of a silicone substrate and another to address activation of an organic coating.

In light of the above amendments and arguments we respectfully submit that the rejection of independent claims 1, 40 and 42 is overcome by amendment and argument. We note that the balance of the rejected claims are dependent claims. Since these dependent claims now depend from allowable independent claims we furthermore submit that the rejections in respect of the balance of the claims are also overcome.

Allowance of the subject application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this document is being transmitted
to the Patent and Trademark Office via electronic filing.

September 23, 2011
(Date of Transmission)

Lonnie Louie
(Name of Person Transmitting)

/Lonnie Louie/
(Signature)

Very truly yours,

/ Mavis S. Gallenson 32,464/

Mavis S. Gallenson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 32,464
LADAS & PARRY LLP
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300